

**REMARKS**

Claims 11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 11 and 14 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Gesesse to Applicant's representative during the personal interview conducted April 20, 2006. The points discussed during the interview are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the substance of the interview.

Claims 11, 14, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Foti (U.S. Patent 5,974,309). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, a method of transmitting an identity of a calling subscriber to a called subscriber, wherein the called subscriber is a mobile subscriber in a mobile communication system comprising switching centers for establishing a speech connection between the calling subscriber and a mobile station assigned to the called subscriber, wherein one of the switching centers is associated with the called subscriber. The method comprises storing permanent subscriber data in a home location register and storing temporary subscriber data in a visitor location register, and transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information.

MPEP § 2131 states: "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." (Citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).)

Foti cannot anticipate claim 11 because Foti does not disclose, at least, : 1) storing permanent subscriber data in a home location register of a second mobile communication system and storing temporary subscriber data in a visitor location register of the second mobile communication system, and 2) transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information.

During the interview, the undersigned argued that Foti does not disclose or suggest, at least, storing temporary subscriber data in a visitor location register of the mobile communication system of the called subscriber. Examiner Gesesse noted that Foti discloses a visitor location register (VLR) in column 3, lines 4-5. However, as noted by the undersigned, Foti discloses the use of a VLR in the context of Figure 1, which as noted by the undersigned

during the interview, is a depiction of a known (i.e. prior art) method of monitoring cellular calls. See column 2, lines 27-29, of Foti. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information, as recited in claim 11.

As also noted by the undersigned during the interview, there is no disclosure in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of Foti, of storing temporary subscriber data in a visitor location register of the mobile communication system of the called subscriber. Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information.

As discussed during the interview, Figures 3-5 of Foti depict embodiments in which the calling line identification (CLI) field (populated with the telephone number of the calling mobile station party 14(2)) is transmitted to the home location register (HLR) 20 of the network 10 with the B-number query (B-Q) to determine the called subscriber 14(1) location. However, none of the embodiments of Figures 3-5 of Foti disclose or suggest transmitting the B-number query (B-Q) from the home location register (HLR) 20 to the switching node (SN) 12(2) of the called subscriber 14(1). Therefore, Foti does not disclose or suggest transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber (i.e. the CLI) to the switching center (12(2)) associated with the called subscriber (14(1)) from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information (i.e. the B-number query). Accordingly, Foti does not anticipate or render obvious claim 13.

Claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, transmitting means for transmitting an identity of the calling subscriber to the switching center associated with the called subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information. Foti does not disclose or suggest transmitting the B-number query (i.e. request for routing information) from the HLR 20 to the switching node 12(2) of the called subscriber, in connection with the identity of the calling subscriber (i.e. the CLI). Therefore, Foti does not anticipate or render obvious claim 14.

Claim 16 recites, *inter alia*, a second interface toward a home location register for receiving an identity of the calling subscriber from the home location register in connection with a request for routing information relating to the called subscriber, the second interface being located at the visitor location register.

During the interview, the undersigned argued that Foti does not disclose or suggest, at least, second interface being located at the visitor location register. Examiner Gesesse noted that Foti discloses a visitor location register (VLR) in column 3, lines 4-5. However, as noted by the undersigned, Foti discloses the use of a VLR in the context of Figure 1, which as noted by the undersigned during the interview, is a depiction of a known (i.e. prior art) method of monitoring cellular calls. See column 2, lines 27-29, of Foti. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of second interface being located at a visitor location register, as recited in claim 16.

As also noted by the undersigned during the interview, there is no disclosure in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of Foti, of a visitor location register of the mobile communication system of the called subscriber. Accordingly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Figure 1, or the corresponding text, of second interface being located at the visitor location register.

As discussed during the interview, Figures 3-5 of Foti depict embodiments in which the calling line identification (CLI) field (populated with the telephone number of the calling mobile station party 14(2)) is transmitted to the home location register (HLR) 20 of the network 10 with the B-number query (B-Q) to determine the called subscriber 14(1) location. However, during the interview the undersigned noted that none of the embodiments of Figures 3-5 of Foti disclose the use of a VLR, and argued that Foti does not anticipate claim 16 because none of the embodiments shown in Figures 3-5 of Foti include a VLR.

Examiner Gesesse stated during the interview that the use of a VLR was conventional, and as such, the embodiments of Figures 3-5 of Foti would be expected to include a VLR, for example in the various switching nodes 12 or database 20 of the network 10. The undersigned disagreed and argued that the network 10 of Figures 3-5 does not necessarily (i.e. inherently) include a VLR because both the calling subscriber 14(2) and the called subscriber 14(1) are subscribers to the same network 10. In other words, there is only one mobile network 10 disclosed in the embodiments of Figures 3-5 of Foti. Therefore, there is no recognition by Foti of the problem that all networks do not support the network signalling used in the transmission of the calling subscriber identity. See, for example, page 2, lines 17-21, of the instant application.

In support of these arguments, the undersigned noted column 4, lines 35-51, which discloses that caller identification is a feature now available to mobile station subscribers 14. As disclosed, for example, in column 4, lines 46+, if the called mobile station subscriber

14(1) subscribes to the caller identification service feature, the CLI field is transmitted to the display 42 of the mobile station 14 of the called subscriber 14(1). It is respectfully submitted that it is clear from this disclosure that the CLI is transmitted only if the calling subscriber 14(2) and the called subscriber 14(1) are subscribers to the same network 10.

Examiner Gesesse noted that column 1, lines 1-8, suggest that VLR's are used to monitor the location information of subscribers, and that such a disclosure may suggest that the calling and called subscribers may be subscribers of different cellular (mobile) networks.

The undersigned again noted that column 1, lines 1-8, is a discussion of Figure 1 of Foti, which is disclosed as a prior art ("known") method of monitoring cellular calls. The undersigned also disagreed that such a description of the prior art by Foti discloses or suggests that the calling and called subscribers are on different networks. As disclosed further in column 1, lines 9-14, the calling party (A-party) may comprise either another cellular subscriber (e.g. mobile station 14(2)) of the cellular telephone network 10, or a wireline subscriber of the PSTN 26. It is respectfully submitted that it is clear from this disclosure that if the calling and called subscribers are both from a cellular (mobile) network, than they are from the same cellular (mobile) network 10.

This interpretation of Foti is confirmed in column 6, lines 30-39, which discloses that use of the calling line identification (CLI) field in a cellular network 10 is strictly limited. In accordance with such use restrictions, the calling line identification field cannot be populated with calling party identifying information unless the information is generated within the cellular network 10 (i.e., the calling party is another mobile station subscriber 14), or unless the information is received as calling line identification information (i.e., the calling party is completely connected to the cellular network 10 from the PSTN network 44 by means of an ISUP trunk connection).

Claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, a second interface toward a combination of a visitor location register plus mobile switching center of the mobile communication system for requesting routing information relating to the called subscriber and for transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber to the combination of a visitor location register plus mobile switching center. Foti does not disclose or suggest these features.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 14, 16 and 18 over Foti are respectfully requested.

Claims 13, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foti in view of Yamaguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,002,931). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13, 17 and 19 recite additional features of the invention and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above and for the additional features recited therein. It is further respectfully submitted that Yamaguchi et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Foti discussed above and that even assuming it would have been obvious to combine the references, which Applicant does not concede, such a combination would not include all the claim limitations and would not present a *prima facie* case.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13, 17 and 19 over Foti in view of Yamaguchi et al. are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

By:



John P. Darling

Reg. No.: 44,482

Tel. No.: (703) 770-7745

Fax No.: (703) 770-7901

Date: July 3, 2006

P.O. Box 10500  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-7900